

STAFF WORKSHOP
BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION
AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

DOCKET

06-IEP-1F

DATE JAN 16 2007

RECD. JAN 24 2007

In the Matter of:)
)
Preparation of the 2007 Integrated) Docket No.
Energy Policy Report (2007 IEPR)) 06-IEP-1F
)
Electric Transmission Data Requests)
_____)

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
HEARING ROOM B
1516 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, JANUARY 16, 2007

10:03 A.M.

Reported by:
Peter Petty
Contract No. 150-04-002

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

CEC STAFF PRESENT

Lorraine White

Mark Hesters

Judy Grau

Don Kondoleon

Clare Laufenberg Gallardo

Jim Bartridge

Ajoy Guha

ALSO PRESENT

Les Guliassi

Eric Law

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Bradley Bentley

Rebecca Giles

San Diego Gas and Electric Company

Gerard Stillwagon

Modesto Irrigation District

Sarah Majok

Sacramento Municipal Utility District

Corky Templeman

California Energy Circuit

Nam Nguyen

Southern California Edison Company

Don Smith (via teleconference)

Division of Ratepayer Advocates

California Public Utilities Commission

I N D E X

	Page
Proceedings	1
Opening Remarks	1
Mark Hesters	1
Introductions	2
CEC Staff Presentation	4
Lorraine White	4
Mark Hesters	9
Public Comments	15
Schedule	26
Closing Remarks	32
Adjournment	32
Certificate of Reporter	33

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 10:03 a.m.

3 MR. HESTERS: -- lots of help putting
4 together the forms and instructions, and we'll be
5 doing a presentation later.

6 I just wanted to get through what we
7 call basic housekeeping. For those of you who
8 have not been in here before, the restrooms are
9 out these two doors and make a hard right. You'll
10 see restrooms on the right there.

11 There's a snack bar on the second floor
12 if you head out and head up the stairs. They have
13 coffee and other things.

14 In the event of an emergency and the
15 building is evacuated, please follow anybody who
16 you think might be an Energy Commission
17 employee --

18 MS. WHITE: Us.

19 MS. GRAU: Us.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MS. WHITE: Just follow us out the
22 doors.

23 MR. HESTERS: We'll go out the door and
24 we'll actually re-meet across the street at the
25 park. And that's the easiest thing to do from

1 there. Don't run, walk slowly.

2 (Laughter.)

3 MS. WHITE: Obey all traffic laws.

4 MR. HESTERS: Since we have a pretty
5 small group at the workshop today, why don't we go
6 around and do introductions real quick for those
7 of you, or everybody -- I'm Mark Hesters, from our
8 transmission planning group here at the Energy
9 Commission.

10 MS. WHITE: Lorraine White; I'm the
11 program manager for the 2007 Integrated Energy
12 Policy Report proceeding.

13 MS. GRAU: I'm Judy Grau with the Energy
14 Commission's transmission unit.

15 MR. LAW: Eric Law, PG&E. I'm on the
16 transmission side of the house.

17 MR. GULIASI: Les Guliasi with PG&E.

18 MR. NGUYEN: Nam Nguyen, Southern
19 California Edison, transmission planning.

20 MR. GUHA: Ajoy Guha with transmission
21 system engineering, California Energy Commission.

22 MR. BENTLEY: Brad Bentley, San Diego
23 Gas and Electric, transmission planning.

24 MR. STILLWAGON: Jerry Stillwagon,
25 Modesto Irrigation District; I'm in resource

1 planning.

2 MS. GILES: Rebecca Giles, SDG&E,
3 regulatory affairs.

4 MS. WHITE: Rebecca, do you want to sit
5 up at the table with us, if you would, please? I
6 just want to make sure that we're able to get any
7 comments clearly on the record.

8 MR. KONDOLEON: Don Kondoleon,
9 transmission program manager at the Energy
10 Commission.

11 MS. TEMPLEMAN: Corky Templeman with
12 California Energy Circuit.

13 MS. LAUFENBERG-GALLARDO: Clare
14 Laufenberg-Gallardo, transmission program policy
15 here at the Energy Commission.

16 MR. BARTRIDGE: Jim Bartridge,
17 transmission, Energy Commission.

18 MS. MAJOK: Sarah Majok, transmission,
19 SMUD.

20 MS. WHITE: Sarah, would you be so kind
21 as to sit up here with us at the table. That way
22 if you have any comments as we're going through
23 the workshop you can be easily heard.

24 MS. GRAU: And finally, do we have
25 anyone on the line with us this morning? Okay,

1 hearing none. Oh, I'm sorry, hello? Hello?

2 Could you please say your name, again.

3 MR. SMITH: Don Smith.

4 MS. GRAU: Okay. And you are with?

5 Excuse us, Don, who are you --

6 MR. SMITH: Yes.

7 MS. GRAU: Yeah, who are you with?

8 MR. SMITH: I'm with the Division of
9 Ratepayer Advocates.

10 MS. GRAU: Thank you. Anybody else on
11 the line besides Don? Okay. Thank you.

12 All right, with that we're going to turn
13 it over to Lorraine.

14 MS. WHITE: This morning all I want to
15 really do is kind of run through a brief summary
16 of the overall proceeding for folks.

17 Our data collection activities are an
18 integral part of the development of any of our
19 Integrated Energy Policy Report proceedings
20 because we rely on market participants and
21 utilities and other organizations to provide us
22 with critical data information on which we develop
23 our assessments and analyses.

24 So just so you understand where we're at
25 with the proceedings, where we're going to be

1 going with this whole process, I wanted to just
2 kind of summarize a few things.

3 IEPR requirements, Integrated Energy
4 Policy Report, that is, IEPR requirements are
5 specified in the statutes. Specifically we're
6 charged with doing an assessment and forecast of
7 supply, demand and price for electricity, natural
8 gas and transportation-related fuels.

9 As I mentioned, this information is
10 really coming from the market participants and
11 various organizations, as well as developed by
12 ourselves and agencies. And we take that
13 information; we analyze it in order to develop the
14 assessments and forecasts.

15 We do this in consultation not only with
16 the utilities, but also the various agencies at
17 the federal, state and local level.

18 From the assessments and forecasts and
19 staff's analysis we'll identify various issues
20 that need to be addressed and develop policy
21 recommendations.

22 The IEPR is required every two years, in
23 odd-numbered years. But in the intervening even-
24 numbered years we do what we call our update.
25 What we do in an update is we'll focus on a

1 handful of issues, and in particular this last
2 December we adopted -- pardon me, beginning of
3 January we adopted the '06 update. In which we
4 focused on issues associated with achieving the
5 RPS standards, as well as the connection between
6 land use and energy.

7 That's an example of what we try to do,
8 focus specifically on a limited number of issues
9 and really drive down deep into them and identify
10 actions and program changes that may be required
11 to achieve certain things.

12 For the overall IEPR the statute is
13 fairly clear. It's very broad. We cover a lot of
14 ground. And this is part of that ground we have
15 to cover.

16 For the '07 proceeding there's really
17 four major segments of the proceeding. The first,
18 of course, is data gathering. The second is the
19 analysis part, developing the forecasts and
20 assessment. The third is evaluating various
21 policy issues and developing options to address
22 those policy issues, or program issues. And then,
23 fourth, of course, through various types of public
24 meetings with the Committee on these options,
25 identifying what would be the preferred

1 recommendations.

2 We issued our scoping order for this
3 particular proceeding on the 1st of August '06.
4 And we began our data collection in October. And
5 we'll be continuing the data collection process
6 through March/April timeframe.

7 The earlier we can get the information,
8 the earlier we can actually start our analysis and
9 assessment. And that will actually be done
10 through May of this year.

11 Various papers will be published
12 associated with this assessment and forecasting.
13 And those start showing up in the April through
14 July timeframe.

15 Of course, workshops and hearings will
16 be held throughout the proceeding. There'll be a
17 mix of committee hearings as well as staff events.
18 Those, depending upon the topic, kind of dictate
19 which it will be.

20 In this particular setting these are
21 technically focused types of discussions; more
22 informal; like to get to the core of issues and
23 comments. Whereas when we get to more policy-
24 related discussions they tend to be Committee
25 workshops, a bit more formal, but nonetheless we

1 always want to have public participation and
2 active input from various parties to get to
3 appropriate recommendations by the end of the
4 statutory timeframe, which is November 1st, when
5 we have to actually communicate to the Governor
6 and the Legislature the actual report.

7 This proceeding we're shooting for the
8 24th of October '07 as the business meeting in
9 which we would adopt any Committee recommendation
10 to the Commission, as a whole, so that we can meet
11 that November 1st deadline.

12 In order to do that we'll be producing a
13 Committee draft Integrated Energy Policy Report in
14 the September timeframe.

15 This is an idealistic schedule. As you
16 may recall in the proceedings past some of these
17 dates have slipped and sometimes the report is
18 adopted in November or December. But we're
19 shooting to actually get it done on time. That
20 would be good.

21 Any of the information about the
22 proceeding will be found on the Commission's
23 website, including information about materials
24 that have been docketed for purposes of generating
25 the record on which we would actually develop and

1 make any recommendations.

2 For information about the proceeding as
3 a whole, in general, if you want to know who's
4 actually lead on a particular topic you can always
5 contact me. And then if I can't answer the
6 question for you, we'll direct you to the proper
7 staff to address your comments or concerns or
8 questions.

9 Any questions on the general issues of
10 the proceeding or our schedule? All right, well,
11 then I will hand it back to Mark.

12 MR. HESTERS: Oh, boy.

13 MS. WHITE: Yahoo. That got fancier
14 than I know how to do.

15 (Laughter.)

16 MS. GRAU: You ought to wait till it
17 gets through; it gets even fancier.

18 MS. WHITE: I didn't do that.

19 MR. HESTERS: Hi, I'm Mark Hesters.
20 This is a really brief overview of the actually
21 fairly brief forms and instructions. And that's
22 about it to start the first one. Just page down?

23 MS. WHITE: Um-hum.

24 MR. HESTERS: Basically who should be
25 filing in response to the forms and instructions.

1 It's transmission-owning load-serving entities.
2 We're happy if agencies such as the Transmission
3 Agency of Northern California or TANC file on
4 behalf of their members.

5 In general, for projects that are not
6 proposed by an LSE, the interconnecting utilities
7 or utility should file the required information.
8 This points to projects like LEAPS or another one
9 shows up is the Desert Southwest Transmission
10 Project, where the Imperial Irrigation District
11 actually shows up as the lead agency for NEPA
12 analysis. And so they should be filing, if that's
13 the -- to make that a little more clear.

14 We have a list of some of those projects
15 actually in the forms and instructions. And we
16 actually point to specific utilities who should be
17 filing on those.

18 As we go further through this, the
19 filing requirements are pretty -- they're not very
20 strict. They do allow you to point to websites or
21 other places where the information is. You don't
22 have to go through and produce it all yourself.

23 Let's just go through brief information
24 on what we basically want; most recent
25 transmission expansion plan. Where a transmission

1 expansion plan is part of a resource plan, the
2 resource plan works just as well.

3 We, in general, are looking for a
4 description of the bulk transmission network.
5 That's basically anything over 100 kV. If your
6 system's small enough that 100 kV is what -- is
7 something smaller than that is what you're using
8 to not tie directly to load, as distribution, then
9 that would be the information. Whatever you're
10 using as a bulk network.

11 We've basically broken it down into four
12 sections -- well, three sections on direct
13 transmission. One of them is limits on imports
14 into your system. The second one is limits within
15 the system. The third one is transmission that's
16 required for state policy goals such as the
17 renewable energy requirements replacement of aging
18 power plants or reduction of local capacity
19 requirements or needs.

20 Whatever -- if there are other policies
21 that come up that you're aware of that as a
22 utility you're attempting to meet, and that's
23 what's being used to justify a transmission
24 project, that would fall into that category. And
25 then the other one is corridor needs.

1 Okay. Basically what we're asking for
2 are details of transmission projects and their
3 alternatives that are planned for operation by
4 2016. We're asking for a general description of
5 any upgrades planned after 2016. We're happy if
6 you rely on public information. Where there's
7 public information available, we're asking for a
8 point to a website or a web address. And a
9 contact in case something happens. Web addresses
10 do change. We will probably go through the web
11 addresses, print out whatever information that
12 you've pointed to and make sure that's docketed
13 just so that we have a firm copy of what's -- of
14 the data that we're relying on. Because websites
15 do change.

16 Pretty simple. General for limits on
17 imports in two-year area, we're looking for a
18 general description of those imports. Again,
19 we're looking for plants to upgrade any import
20 capability through 2016. We're also looking for,
21 over the short term, any maintenance or other
22 planned even small upgrades that would affect the
23 ability to import power into your area through
24 2009.

25 We understand that that's a short term.

1 You may not even have those plans through 2009,
2 but anything that you have planned through 2009 we
3 would like information on and sort of how that
4 affects your ability to import power.

5 One of those would be the, sort of an
6 example from the last couple years was the --
7 trying to remember what part, where they were
8 doing the Pacific DC Intertie. And that was the
9 capability on that was reduced for about six
10 months for some planned maintenance. And that's
11 really what we're looking for, that kind of
12 information.

13 We're also looking for information on,
14 this is both transmission within your network.
15 Again, same idea. General description, any plans
16 to upgrade, and any maintenance that affects that,
17 just for 2009 on the maintenance.

18 And where are we next. Again, there's
19 the biggest, in transmission for state policy
20 goals, obviously the biggest category, this is
21 transmission for renewables. There's big projects
22 in Tehachapi. There's San Diego's Sun Path.
23 There's anything that's specifically tied to
24 meeting state policy goals.

25 The Energy Commission's IEPR 2006

1 identified aging gas plants as the retirement,
2 replacement or repowering of aging gas plants as a
3 policy goal for the state. Anything that relates
4 to sort of bringing us towards those retirement.

5 I know a lot of cases they're owned by
6 private agencies or private entities; and that all
7 that can be done is sort of the end of the need
8 for a local capacity requirement or the need for
9 those for reliability, it's still going to be a
10 decision on a private -- somebody else that the
11 utility or load-serving entities doesn't have
12 control over to shut the plant down. All that you
13 can do is sort of plan to make it not needed. So
14 that was that one.

15 The other one is that's aging gas.
16 Again, local capacity requirements is often tied
17 to these aging plants.

18 For corridor identification basically
19 the corridor identification we've tied to the
20 other three where you have projects that are
21 identified and what we're calling point-to-point
22 transmission needs, we're asking for the
23 identification of any link with federal corridors
24 or -- yes, federal corridors; any potential impact
25 to sensitive areas; consideration of the Garamendi

1 principles, which we've attached at the back of
2 the sheets.

3 There are basically four parts to those.
4 One of those is reliance on basically upgrading
5 existing facilities. The second category, using
6 existing or expanding existing corridors. And
7 then minimizing impacts on sensitive areas. And
8 finally, coordinating with other agencies.

9 And basically any description of work
10 that you've done with local agencies on corridors
11 and any other potential corridor issues.

12 This is our basic schedule. Written
13 comments on the forms and instructions are due on
14 January 19th. Sometime during the week of January
15 22nd we're going to publish the Commission final
16 forms. Those will then go before the full
17 Commission at a business meeting on January 31st.
18 And they will be adopted. And then responses will
19 be due by March 31st.

20 And I think that's it. That's basically
21 it. And we're now open for comments, if anybody
22 has any comments.

23 MR. NGUYEN: Quick question. Nam Nguyen
24 from Southern California Edison. The final forms,
25 are they very similar to about two years ago? Or

1 is the --

2 MR. HESTERS: The final forms are going
3 to look a lot like this. Two years ago when we
4 put them together I tried to make them look like
5 sort of a standard utility transmission plan.
6 Rather than try and set it to a specific form, we
7 just want the plan.

8 That I figured was a simpler -- because
9 people do them different ways. And rather than
10 try and make everybody conform to one format that
11 may change, let's just ask for the plan as it is.

12 No, the forms that are on our website
13 and that are over here are the draft forms. And
14 we're basically planning on modifying those based
15 on comments. And then those are what will go
16 before the Commission.

17 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you.

18 MR. HESTERS: Nothing major will be
19 changed unless there's a major outcry.

20 MR. BENTLEY: Brad Bentley with SDG&E.
21 On the corridor identification, obviously there's
22 some known projects out there, but are you looking
23 for additional information beyond those identified
24 projects, such as Tehachapi, Sun Path and those?

25 MR. HESTERS: I think we're mostly tied

1 to point-to-point needs, which generally would be
2 tied to a specific project, is that correct? Jim
3 Bartridge is our --

4 MR. BARTRIDGE: At this point we're not
5 looking this year to be designating corridors. So
6 this is really a longer term. If you think you
7 might need a corridor in the future and want to
8 take advantage of SB-1059 corridor designation;
9 then we'd be looking for any information you can
10 provide us.

11 Definitely not to the level of detail
12 that I think that you put into the SDG&E -- and
13 what's going on -- anything else under that.

14 MR. BENTLEY: Are you looking to use
15 this as kind of like a coordination with maybe
16 some of the DOE --

17 MR. BARTRIDGE: Exactly. Yeah.

18 MR. BENTLEY: So a lot of the
19 information is more for informational purposes
20 here, or to start something if needed.

21 MR. HESTERS: That's the case.

22 MR. LAW: This is Eric Law, PG&E. Just
23 maybe a quick, I guess a clarification from you.
24 You are asking for the information supplied for
25 any project between 2007 and 2016. And probably

1 you probably realize that a lot of project,
2 depending how mature they are, some information --
3 some of the project have more information and more
4 accurate information.

5 So I think when we supply those data you
6 probably should expect that for some of the
7 project that are far out, we may not have the type
8 of detail or the type of accuracy you want on the
9 information. I hope you are amenable to that.

10 MR. HESTERS: We fully expect that's the
11 case. The closer term project, more defined
12 projects, we expect you'll have more information
13 on. The ones closer to 2016 are the ones less
14 developed. We expect that you'll have less
15 information on them.

16 We're not expecting you to go out and do
17 full-blown studies of projects that you haven't --
18 that aren't very far along yet.

19 MR. LAW: That's correct. The other
20 question is that I presume and a lot of our
21 information also in WECC website. And I presume
22 that CEC is a member of WECC. You can access that
23 website, even though they have some of them --

24 MR. HESTERS: Yes, we can. I mean one
25 of the problems that we had -- not problems, but

1 what we're looking for, if you could point to the
2 website. Sometimes things are buried. And
3 sometimes they're buried on the FERC website for
4 some federal projects that are going through
5 environmental analysis through FERC.

6 And they are sometimes really hard to
7 find if you're not directly involved in them, or
8 not on the mailing list. So that's why we're
9 asking just for websites and a contact that we can
10 get to. We can access that and print it out and
11 make sure it's available to other people.

12 MS. WHITE: But the complete pathway on
13 the website. Not just, please go to FERC's
14 website.

15 MR. HESTERS: Yeah.

16 MS. WHITE: You know, we need to get
17 specifically down that pathway to where that
18 document is within that website.

19 MR. LAW: Well, I was referring
20 specifically. You're talking about a transfer
21 capability, and then the WECC do have different
22 path rating catalogue. Point you to a certain
23 page, you know.

24 MS. WHITE: Um-hum.

25 MR. LAW: Okay.

1 MR. GUHA: We do need also the standards
2 of the project and the schedule --

3 MR. HESTERS: That's all sort of part of
4 the project description, yeah.

5 Any other comments?

6 MR. BENTLEY: Brad Bentley with SDG&E
7 again. A little bit specific on the actual forms.

8 On page 5 you have a title, or a table
9 with a Frontier Line transmission project. And
10 you denote the three PTOs as being responsible.

11 Are you expecting us to get together to
12 submit something on that? Or is it just more or
13 less we got to come together and figure out who's
14 going to submit individuals? Or do you have a
15 preference or --

16 MR. HESTERS: If -- I don't really have
17 a preference. I know PG&E's doing some work
18 through a contract, and actually I think the
19 contract's through here on that work, on Frontier;
20 coordinating with PG&E on that. And basically
21 pointing to PG&E on that, as long as PG&E says we
22 agree that San Diego and Edison or somebody else
23 are working with us on this one, that's fine.
24 Just make sure there's a reference back and forth;
25 that it's not just San Diego saying PG&E's doing

1 it and PG&E saying San Diego's doing it.

2 (Laughter.)

3 MR. BENTLEY: Yeah. Well, I'm just
4 wondering, -- and that's exactly what I want to
5 try and avoid is, you know, --

6 MR. HESTERS: Right.

7 MR. BENTLEY: -- each one, I thought you
8 were going to file something. So do you want
9 to -- are you going to take the lead in trying to
10 canvass to make sure that you're getting the
11 response from somebody? Or do you want it upon
12 the three PTOs here to --

13 MR. KONDOLEON: Yeah, I think it should
14 be incumbent upon the respondents to coordinate a
15 response. As Mark indicated earlier, for TANC as
16 the example, that he felt that it would be
17 reasonable to have TANC respond on behalf of its
18 members.

19 I think with regard to the interstate
20 projects where there's multiple participants, it
21 would make sense if we could get a coordinated
22 response amongst the parties. If you could do
23 that on your own, I think we would welcome that.
24 If there's an issue with that, why don't you let
25 Mark know. But I think that would be the most

1 efficient process with regard to response.

2 And I know that you're working together
3 through the partnership because obviously I'm part
4 of it, too, myself. So I would just encourage you
5 to do that.

6 What we want is we want credible, up-to-
7 date information. And what we don't want it to
8 be, repetitive, you know, with regards to you
9 having to do your own individual filings on the
10 same information.

11 So to the degree that you can coordinate
12 that response and indicate to us that that's what
13 you did, and if there's an issue with that with
14 regard to your preparation of that response, just
15 let Mark know ahead of time, and we can give you
16 more guidance.

17 MR. BENTLEY: I'll talk to the person
18 who's on the work groups on that.

19 MR. KONDOLEON: Right.

20 MR. LAW: Brad, right?

21 MR. BENTLEY: Yes.

22 MR. LAW: And Nam -- Eric, I have work
23 on this from tier transmission line, and there is
24 a public web publishing all those reports, you
25 know, and we got into that. If you want, I can

1 be, maybe, you know, coordinate you guys, and then
2 just send them the link to those are reporting,
3 kind of satisfy the requirement.

4 MR. BENTLEY: Sure, if you want to take
5 the lead, I'm happy --

6 MR. HESTERS: That sounds good.

7 MR. LAW: I'll work with you guys.

8 MR. BENTLEY: All right.

9 MR. NGUYEN: Well, I have one comment on
10 the same page 5, the table, one of the projects on
11 the bottom, Northern Light, Edison is not involved
12 in this project. And I'm not aware of any
13 activities that we're involved with. I'm not sure
14 about PG&E, but if PG&E, you know, has
15 participated in this project, maybe you should
16 take the lead, providing the project description.

17 MR. KONDOLEON: Yeah, if that's the
18 case, if you could indicate to us that your
19 company has not had any contact with those parts
20 of -- interstate projects, these are set up as
21 examples, basically, based on some of the
22 information that we had. I had my own questions
23 about the fact that Edison actually hadn't
24 participated in the Northern Light, myself. I do
25 believe there has been some contact with PG&E.

1 It would be great if you can indicate
2 that to us; that would be sufficient.

3 And if there's other projects, other
4 interstate opportunities that you've been pursuing
5 that we haven't indicated here, and not just
6 interstate, but you know, intrastate, please, you
7 know, we're looking to try to uncover any and all
8 projects that are on the drawing board that we may
9 not be aware of.

10 MR. HESTERS: This isn't an exhaustive
11 list. This was more of an example.

12 MR. BENTLEY: Sure, but obviously you
13 hit the high ones, so --

14 MR. HESTERS: Yeah.

15 MR. BENTLEY: Also on that table the
16 Lake Elsinore advance pump storage. Nam, did you
17 have a --

18 MR. NGUYEN: Well, on this one we
19 probably can coordinate with you guys in, you
20 know, providing data to the CEC.

21 MR. BENTLEY: All right.

22 MR. HESTERS: You're perfectly allowed
23 to point to ISO studies for the southern
24 California area and those kinds of things. That's
25 perfectly fine.

1 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. And another thing
2 I'd like to point out as far, the Commission
3 expansion plan, we are proposing a lot of
4 projects. The status of these projects, you know,
5 some of them only been approved by the ISO and
6 internal management.

7 Others, you know, they are still
8 pending. And even others under development. So
9 maybe, you know, will be approved or not,
10 depending on whether we can get internal
11 management approval and the ISO.

12 So, that's something that you should be
13 aware of when you're forming policy, you know, for
14 California.

15 MR. HESTERS: And I mean there are the
16 sets of tables that often come out as part of your
17 expansion plans. And usually those have the ISO
18 approval versus internal approval. And when that
19 approval is expected.

20 And that's what we expect to see in
21 those plans. Don't go taking the information out
22 for us. Leave what you have in there, please.

23 MR. NGUYEN: And, you know, the ISO is
24 planning to issue the 2006 transmission plan which
25 will include our expansion plan report.

1 MR. HESTERS: Right, and pointing to
2 that is fine, too.

3 MR. NGUYEN: Okay.

4 MR. BENTLEY: SDG&E is probably going to
5 be on the same page there, so.

6 MR. HESTERS: Okay. Yeah.

7 MR. LAW: So, Mark, when we sent you the
8 expansion plan and then you -- it's a pretty
9 massive document, as far as PG&E's concerned -- so
10 you would go through that and pick out the
11 information?

12 MR. HESTERS: Yeah.

13 MR. LAW: Okay.

14 MR. HESTERS: Yeah, we'll give those --
15 we actually, I mean I get those anyway. Mostly
16 it's just to make them available to other members
17 of the public. That's the main reason for having
18 you file those. They're sometimes hard for other
19 people to get ahold of.

20 Any other questions?

21 MS. GRAU: Do we have any comments from
22 anybody on the phone line?

23 MR. HESTERS: Nothing else?

24 MR. KONDOLEON: Mark, maybe before we
25 get done we talk about the next step, which is

1 beyond our receipt of the data responses. It's
2 anticipated that we will have a number of staff
3 workshops, certainly one workshop, to cover this
4 topic, meaning the status of transmission within
5 California, with the expectation that we will be
6 presenting results from your responses at a
7 Commission workshop in front of the Electricity,
8 Integrated Energy Policy Committee.

9 And that's -- we've talked about trying
10 to do that sometime in the April/May timeframe.
11 So, this is consistent with what we have done in
12 the previous years, in '03 and '05, where we've
13 taken information and had a number of workshops
14 where we've developed questions that will be
15 addressed somewhere along the line in the actual
16 policy document, itself.

17 So, just be prepared that at some point
18 we will be having the next phase of this
19 Commission workshops on the subject of
20 transmission, interstate, intrastate, renewable
21 transmission, and corridors. And those will be
22 identified and announced in advance. And we'd
23 certainly welcome your participation.

24 MR. HESTERS: And we'll probably provide
25 some summary of where we're -- I mean some

1 direction of where we're going with this
2 information; and those that specifically looking
3 for comments on that. And that's both for
4 developing policies for the IEPR, as well as
5 developing our strategic transmission plan.

6 MR. BENTLEY: Right now I don't think
7 there's too many confidentiality issues. Is there
8 anything that you see as far as confidential
9 information? The transmission plans should be
10 public once they're in the Cal-ISO transmission
11 plan, so.

12 MR. HESTERS: Yeah, the only -- last
13 time the only group -- Edison was the only utility
14 that had an issue with confidentiality with their
15 transmission plan. It was the same transmission
16 plan that was available to stakeholders. So we
17 couldn't very well see keeping it confidential.

18 But I can't --

19 MR. NGUYEN: Well, actually we have two
20 versions of the expansion plan report; one for the
21 California-ISO, which presently includes
22 everything, costs and maps --

23 MR. HESTERS: Okay.

24 MR. NGUYEN: For the stakeholder version
25 we redact a lot of the information from the

1 report.

2 MR. HESTERS: Okay. I'm trying to think
3 of how we should be -- the maps were the real
4 issue confidentiality-wise. We'll have to sort of
5 talk about how to deal with the maps. The issue
6 with that is security basically on the maps.

7 I don't know. Don, do you --

8 MR. KONDOLEON: It's an ongoing issue.

9 MR. HESTERS: Yeah, it's one of those
10 ones, yeah, where if you feel like it's an issue,
11 it can be an issue. And if you don't feel like
12 it's an issue, --

13 MR. BENTLEY: So, should we -- so, for
14 those matters should we be submitting basically
15 two parts, then. One, maybe a redacted version so
16 that you can publicly use the information. And
17 the one that maybe gives you a little bit more,
18 the maps and such; submit that under the
19 confidentiality side.

20 MR. HESTERS: I guess that's probably
21 the way to do it, with the understanding that I
22 can't make any guarantees about what stays
23 confidential. As you know from last time, there
24 were some hearings and I think there's even a
25 lawsuit about confidentiality.

1 MR. KONDOLEON: Yeah, I think the
2 issue's going to be the level of detail on the
3 maps. I mean, specifically we're not looking for
4 digitized maps that we're going to be posting on
5 the website.

6 I think, you know, it's common knowledge
7 and understanding that, you know, you can draw
8 maps; they're on the ISO website; they're on your
9 own website, showing interconnections between
10 points. So we would suspect that that information
11 is not confidential.

12 What I think personally that what folks
13 have taken an issue with is the fact of us trying
14 to release a GIS type information on point-to-
15 point. And I don't think we're asking for that
16 level at this time. But I think that the mere
17 fact of some of those maps that we've seen in your
18 own annual reports, reports that you've provided
19 to other parties, you know, specifically the ISO,
20 I would believe that those would be deemed
21 nonconfidential at this point.

22 MR. HESTERS: Yeah, I mean basically the
23 sort of one lines that aren't giving geographical
24 information, I don't see there being any security
25 issues with those. And wouldn't expect there to

1 be confidentiality issues.

2 If there were more specific geographic
3 information, I could see we don't need that
4 submitted.

5 MR. BENTLEY: Okay, so you don't need
6 that level of detail --

7 MR. HESTERS: No.

8 MR. BENTLEY: -- necessarily for the
9 IEPR.

10 MR. HESTERS: No, we can deal with
11 the -- yeah.

12 MS. GRAU: I would like to offer,
13 Fernando de Leon is our lead attorney on
14 confidentiality issues. He is available; he's on
15 standby right now in case anybody in this workshop
16 had any questions. So if you have anything
17 specific you'd like to ask him, I can call him and
18 bring him down here in a couple of minutes.

19 And/or just to refer on page 4 of the
20 forms and instructions, we do have his email
21 address and phone number in part of the
22 confidentiality.

23 So, if anybody would like to ask
24 anything specific of a lawyer right now, I'd be
25 happy to get him. Otherwise? Okay, all right.

1 Thank you.

2 MR. HESTERS: Any other questions? I
3 think that's it. We'll hopefully see written
4 comments on the 19th. If you have any serious
5 issues we will again respond to those comments,
6 and the document will be before the Commission on
7 the 31st at the business meeting.

8 MS. GRAU: All right, is that it?

9 MR. HESTERS: I think that's it.

10 MS. GRAU: Okay.

11 MR. HESTERS: Thank you all for coming.

12 MS. GRAU: Thank you.

13 (Whereupon, at 10:39 a.m., the staff
14 workshop was adjourned.)

15 --o0o--

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, PETER PETTY, an Electronic Reporter,
do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person
herein; that I recorded the foregoing California
Energy Commission Staff Workshop; that it was
thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of
counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said
workshop, nor in any way interested in outcome of
said workshop.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
my hand this 23rd day of January, 2007.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345